

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Withers, et al.	
Application No.: 10/527,495	Group Art Unit: 1652
Filed: 3/11/2005	Examiner: Ganapathiram Raghu
Title: Engineered Enzymes and Their Use for Synthesis of Thioglycosides	Confirmation No: 4792
Attorney Docket No.: UBC.P-034	

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to Restriction Requirement

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed April 25, 2006 for the above-captioned application. Applicants hereby elect the election of Group I (Claims 20-29) and as a species beta-glycosidase of *Cellulomonas fimi* Cex E127A as set forth in Claim 27. Claims 20-23, 26 and 27 read on the elected species.

This election is made with traverse.

In presenting the restriction requirement, the Examiner presented four groups of claims, but only presented arguments as to why Groups I and IV are different. Groups I-III are related as a product (Group III), a process for specifically making the product (Group II) and a means (the enzyme) for carrying out the method (Group I). Note that the same mutant enzyme description appears in the independent claim of each group. These are clearly the type of related inventions that meet the unity of invention requirement as set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action. Thus, the restriction as it relates to Groups I, II and III it is in error and should be withdrawn.

Applicants further submit that the restriction as between Groups I and IV is not correct because the Group I claims are generic with respect to the claims of Group IV. The claims of Group IV refer to a fusion protein, but must include a mutant enzyme disclosed in the same terms as in the claims of Group I. The difference is that the materials of Group I also include a second part of the fusion which can be used for immobilization. The enzyme and fusion protein have the same required catalytic activities and can be used in the same processes for the same purpose.

Appln No.: 10/527,495

Amendment Dated: May 15, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2006

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Unity of Invention exists for all claims of this application. Thus, withdrawal of the restriction requirement and consideration of all claims is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,



Marina T. Larson, Ph.D

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 32038

(970) 262-1800